

Sorong, Waimena, Nabire and the city which was overwhelmed by rioting and peaceful demonstration for a Free Papua on 7th July 1998.

The newspaper report states that Indonesia's President, B.J. Habibie, has agreed to a national dialogue of West Papua as soon as possible. The proposed dialogue, supported by Indonesian parliamentary leader Abdul Gafur and the Indonesian Council of Protestant Churches, would cover a three-part agenda including human rights problems, autonomy issues, and the issue of independence.

Mr. Speaker, this pronouncement by President Habibie is extremely encouraging news, and President Habibie should be commended for his leadership envisioned in addressing this long-festering wound in Indonesia.

As the United States Congress has spoken out forcibly on East Timor, Mr. Speaker, I am confident that our colleagues fully support President Habibie's call for establishment of this vital dialogue between West Papua and the Government of Indonesia.

To ensure that the dialogue proceeds in a credible and legitimate manner, however, we recognize that certain fundamental steps are absolutely necessary.

First, a dialogue must be structured to facilitate full and democratic participation, including representatives from all sectors of society in West Papua. This should include recognized and respected community leaders, church leaders, students, women's organizations, academics, West Papuans who participated in the United Nations sponsored act of free choice, which was actually an act of no choice, and historical and cultural experts.

Second, the Indonesian Government should terminate West Papuan status as a military operations area which allows martial law to be imposed in West Papua as well as in East Timor and Aceh. The military's involvement in West Papua's political and economic development should also be terminated, Mr. Speaker. Additionally, immediate steps should be taken to investigate and prosecute military personnel responsible for human rights violations throughout West Papua, New Guinea.

Last, Mr. Speaker, there must be increased transparency and openness in West Papua which can only be accomplished by allowing churches, non-governmental organizations, and independent international human rights organizations to monitor full access to all areas of the province.

In concluding, Mr. Speaker, I would ask my colleagues to join me in commending President Habibie for this courageous decision on West Papua, New Guinea and that he be urged to take the foregoing steps to ensure that a successful and productive dialogue take place as soon as possible.

And, Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege recently of meeting with the gentleman, Mr. John Kubiak, who is the

leader of the human rights organization in West Papua, New Guinea, who was recently here in Washington. And I am very, very hopeful that my colleagues here in the Congress and the American people will support this effort to allow, especially allow the people of West Papua, New Guinea to determine for themselves what should their future be and not be subjected as a colony of Indonesia as in our stance.

HOW DO WE DEAL RESPONSIBLY WITH THE SOCIAL SECURITY TRUST FUND?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. MINGE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin by associating myself with the remarks of my colleague from Arkansas (Mr. BERRY) with respect to Social Security and budget policy tax-cut issues. I certainly feel that he has accurately identified a problem that we face in this country: How do we deal responsibly with the Social Security Trust Fund and our obligations or the obligations which will be due from that trust fund in the years ahead? Although all of us, I think, would agree that the tax cut proposal that is being considered or has been considered in the Committee on Ways and Means is a moderate proposal and that it distributes benefits equitably among the American people, the really difficult question is at what stage should we implement this proposal? Should we implement it when we borrow from the Social Security Trust Fund yet to balance the budget, or should we postpone the implementation of a proposal of that type until after we know that we no longer need to use the Social Security Trust Fund to balance the budget?

□ 2115

I would like to, however, extend my comments this evening beyond the budget issues that are raised with respect to Social Security and move to a slightly different topic area. ***

We have many responsibilities here in Congress. Perhaps most significantly, we should not let those actions deter us from attempting to complete the work on the budget. The budget that this body and the body at the other end of the building would have agreed to is 5 months and 2 days past due.

Mr. Speaker, we have an awesome responsibility here to comply with the Budget Act, and we are not doing it. It is difficult to prepare and bring to the floor appropriations bills which fit within a budget that we have not yet adopted, or to identify the scale of tax cuts that we would like to work on when we have no budget with which to place those tax cuts in context. In fact, it appears that many of these efforts to bring bills to the floor, to discuss tax cuts are lonely efforts, because they are efforts that do not have within them that budget.

It reminds me of the claymation figure that was used in the 1950s, a little figure that one of my staff members found a replica of: Gumby. Poor Gumby. His friend was Pokey. They wanted company. These appropriations bills, this tax cut consideration needs a friend. It needs the Budget Act, or it needs the budget resolution, and the fact that we do not have a budget resolution makes me think that the old 1950s figures live again here in Congress in the 1990s.

Mr. Speaker, I challenge the leadership of this body and of the Senate to appoint a conference committee so that the budget resolutions that were adopted in the respective bodies can be reconciled, so that this body is acting responsibly, and so we know that we have complied with the laws that we ourselves have adopted and lay down the standards for responsible fiscal planning. We need a budget resolution for the 1999 fiscal year.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SNOWBARGER). The Chair must remind all Members to refrain from personal references to the President.

THE ARMS RACE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, we are in a race, and the participants in the race, along with the United States of America, are nations like North Korea, Iran, Iraq, Communist China, and to some degree, Pakistan and India. The other participants in this race seem to understand that it is a race because they are doing everything that they can to develop offensive missiles that have increasing capability and can go long distances, now almost to the point where this last shot that was fired over Japan by the North Koreans, the so-called Taepo Dong 1 missile, a 3-stage missile, had enough range to reach portions of the United States of America. That is the North Koreans now, years before the CIA ever thought that they would be this far, have now developed a missile that has ICBM capability. That means the capability to reach parts of the United States.

Now, on the other side of the race is the American effort to develop defenses against these missiles, and this American effort really started in 1983 when then President Ronald Reagan told the Nation that we were entering the age of missiles, and that we had to do something about it, and that rather than just have the ability to retaliate; that is, throw our missiles back at that enemy, whoever it might be, we needed to be able to develop the ability to shoot down incoming missiles.

Now, that lesson that Ronald Reagan gave us in 1983 was driven home in the